



MACCE Report to Missouri State Board of Education

Dr. Gale “Hap” Hairston, Ed.D.

411 Central Methodist College

Fayette, MO 65248

(660) 248-6393

FAX - (660) 248-6294

ghairsto@cmc.edu

www.cmc.edu

To: Missouri State Board of Education Members

Topic: Report – Missouri Advisory Council of Certification for Educators

Date: Thursday – January 8, 2004

Mission:

The mission of MACCE is: (1) to be a proactive and visible advocate for learners in Missouri through educator certification; (2) to promote a vision of professionalism in teaching, and (3) to communicate with the Commissioner, State Board of Education, and other relevant stakeholders.

- I. Examine the factors impacting the supply and demand of a quality teaching force:
 - A. Praxis cut-off scores
 - B. Monitor the quality of the teaching force
 - C. Monitor the supply of school personnel in critical needs areas
 - D. Determine who has what responsibility for the verification of competency mastery in the preparation of teachers, including transfer and exit.
 - E. Monitor and make recommendations with regard to alternative routes to certification
- II. Evaluate and monitor the efforts to streamline the certification and program approval processes with the following actions:
 - A. Review and monitor the effects of rule changes
 - B. Monitor legislation concerning certification issues

Current Membership & Representation in Alphabetical Order:

Missouri Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (4)
Missouri Association of Elementary School Principals (1)
Missouri Association of School Administrators (1)
Missouri Chapter – American Association of School Personnel (1)
Missouri Community College Association (1)
Missouri Federation of Teachers & School Related Personnel (2)
Missouri National Education Association (6)
Missouri School Boards Association (1)
Missouri State Teachers Association (7)
Missouri Teacher of the Year (1)
Missouri Unit Association of Teacher Educators (1)

Meetings: August 3 & 4, October 5 & 6, and December 7 & 8, 2003
February 1 & 2, and April 4 & 5, 2004

Mentoring – Includes setting standards for the mentoring process and standards for the individual mentors that include a broad set of district standards while allowing for individualized, localized specifics:

1st and 2nd year mentoring standards

Across-district standards (allowing mentors to assist other schools/districts)

Standards to assist low performing districts and achievement gap closure.

The mentoring subcommittee identified various reasons why the current mentoring guidelines are not working. The reasons identified were: retention, new teachers not getting what they need, use of professional development funds for mentoring, and release time to be a mentor. The committee decided the primary problem with the current mentoring guidelines is the release time for the classroom teacher to be a mentor and for the new teacher to observe good classroom practices. The main reason identified was the lack of funds to provide substitutes. The subcommittee began looking at ways to overcome this problem.

First of these would be to make a teachers first year of teaching an intern year in which they would receive some pay with the rest of a full teachers salary being used to provide release time to a master teacher to mentor that individual. This idea would require a change in education at 4 years followed by a one year internship. Financial aid for students would have to be looked at if the students are required to pay the university for 1 semester of credit with the other semester being sponsored by the school district paying the employee.

The second idea was using retired teachers as certified mentors. Retired teachers would go through mentoring training provided by DESE consisting of diversity training, androgody (teaching adults), current educational practices and policies, and possibly a screening test for job aptitude. These mentors would receive a mentoring certificate good for five years. They could be paid through district professional development funds or at the state level through the professional development fund. Retirement hours would have to be looked at to determine a way to utilize these teachers without affecting their retirement benefits.

The third idea presented was to use the STARR teacher program. During the training year STARR teachers would receive training in mentoring. They would receive a mentoring certificate upon completion of the training. They would be mentors during their STARR year for districts served by their RPDC. There was also discussion of combining ideas 2 and 3 and having them work out of the RPDC. STARR teachers would mentor the first year teachers and the retired teachers would do second year mentoring for the RPDC region. This idea could be implemented fairly quickly and with little changes to programs already in place but with positive results for the new teacher.

After identification of these three possibilities there was a discussion as to how much time a mentor needs to be in the classroom. Several ideas were presented such as 20% for first year teachers and 10% for second year teachers. The second year of mentoring would focus on the identified areas at the end of the first year of teaching in which the new teacher needs improvement. These are just ideas that would need to be discussed and evaluated as to the effectiveness of this amount of time for the new teacher.

The next discussion was concerning the minimum number of years needed to be a mentor. This would need to be established as to set a guideline so that a teacher could not retire after a few years of teaching to be a mentor.

The rest of the meeting was discussion on various matters. The first was how a current teacher used as a mentor would fit into the picture. After some discussion it was decided they would work well as a buddy teacher with no evaluation roles. They would be used to help a new teacher acclimate to the school climate and to help a new teacher learn the processes and procedures of the building. This teacher should be at the same grade level as a new teacher. The next matter discussed was the need for the new mentoring guidelines to be tied to MSIP. This would give us an opportunity to make them more uniform across the state. It was also discussed that the current Transition to Teaching program would be tied to the new mentoring guidelines.

The committee decided to break up tasks before our next meeting in February. Tasks to be reported on in February include:

- Review current state guidelines to identify what changes would need to be made or clarified
- Areas of the achievement gap and mentoring and how they can be incorporated
- Research current RPDC and STARR program to see how they can be incorporated
- Talk to retired teachers to determine interest and garner involvement
- Ways to incorporate mentoring into the MSIP standards.

The subcommittee would like to request presentations at the February meeting from DESE concerning current issues in these areas: Professional Development, Closing the Achievement Gap, and Mentoring. The subcommittee would also like a report on the number of first and second year teachers in Missouri.

Professional Development for Beginning Educators – Includes general “induction” information, strategies, and specific training to cover:

- Classroom management**
- Reading**
- Home, Family, Community Relations**
- Closing the achievement gap.**

The MACCE Subcommittee for Professional Development regarding Beginning Teachers Assistance organized their work during the October meeting. Several subcommittee members volunteered to contact various groups and/or collect data that was presented and reviewed during the December meeting.

We agreed that the development of teachers is a complex process. There is a need to individualize experiences that are developmentally appropriate for beginning teachers. Time and resources will always be a challenge that must be met in order to provide quality beginning teacher assistance programs. It is important to have an approach that focuses upon student achievement and the development of professional educators who understand that:

- Teaching is an art and a science;
- Teaching is a decision-making process;
- Teachers construct meaning from their experiences in and out of the classroom.

Members of our committee presented the information they had gathered since October.

School districts have a major role in this area and have identified various professional development opportunities for beginning teachers. A variety of meeting options are utilized from release time to after hours and/or weekend workshops. Missouri is also blessed with a large number of professional groups who play a role in the development of beginning teachers. Those groups include our teacher & administrator associations, regional professional development centers/STARR teachers, colleges/universities, cooperatives, and private groups.

We reviewed particular aspects of a St. Louis Suburban School District. This school district was losing approximately 100 out of 1,000 teachers each year. Most of these teachers were leaving during their first three years of teaching. The school district has been successful in reversing this trend. They are following a professional development model developed by one of Missouri's professional education associations. The school district and building level administration has worked hard to develop an evaluation system that is cooperative in nature. The beginning teacher, mentor, and building level administration focus their efforts on helping the teachers grow and develop in a non-judgmental environment. Proximity plays a key role in their mentor assignments. Mentors and the beginning teachers are matched according to teaching assignments, location in the building, and the availability of common release time.

The Missouri Standards for Teacher Education Programs (MoSTEP) requires colleges and universities to provide assistance their 1st and 2nd year graduates. Our Missouri colleges and universities utilize a variety of informal and formal strategies to meet this unfunded standard. Distance remains a challenge. The most frequently identified form of assistance involves workshop opportunities. Some of these workshops are sponsored by the higher educational institutions. Some of these workshops are held in partnership with one or more of the groups mentioned in the preceding paragraph. Personal visits are made by some of our educator preparation programs. Newsletters are another way in which assistance is provided to new educators. MoSTEP Standards also asks colleges and universities to survey their 1st and 2nd year graduates as a way to provide information for program consideration and change.

A May 2003 dissertation from the University of Missouri identified various areas and issues of concern voiced teachers who have left and/or were considering leaving the profession. The research focused upon 6 areas:

- Socialization and the school culture
- Professional skills
- Predicted concerns
- Professional development
- Retention
- Professional requirements.

The author identified issues identified by those who have left the teaching profession. Those issues included:

- Relevance of the workload and relationship to teaching
- Time management
- Mentoring
- Personalization
- Limiting extracurricular duty assignments.

The subcommittee thanked everyone for their contributions and decided to move forward with plans for the February meeting. It was decided to develop an action research project that would take the concerns identified by those leaving the profession and seeking input from Missouri's 1st

and 2nd year teachers. We would develop our recommendations based upon those findings. It will also be important for all of our subgroups to pull their thoughts together to share later in the spring.

Professional Development for Experienced/All Educators – Includes the individual growth plans as well as:

Specific content knowledge in areas identified by the school/district

Diversity issues

Closing the achievement group.

The MACCE Professional Development subcommittee for all educators recommends that effective professional development be based on current standards established in the following: Missouri Commissioner's Award of Excellence for Professional Development, the revised NSDC Standards for Staff Development and/or the six Missouri Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation standards.

Effective staff development programs, as indicated in current research, include a focus that is addressed over time, is on-going, range in levels from knowledge to application, and reflect multiple opportunities at higher levels (i.e. practice/feedback, coaching, and reflection). Diversity and closing the achievement gap are addressed with the recommended standards.

It is important that each district be allowed to develop their own system, yet it is equally important that all districts be working towards identified standards of excellence.

Standards for Performance Based Teacher Evaluation

1. Students actively participate and are successful in learning process.
2. Various forms of assessment are used to monitor and manage student learning.
3. The teacher is prepared and knowledgeable of the content and effectively maintains student's on-task behavior.
4. The teacher uses professional communication and interaction with school community.
5. The teacher keeps current on instructional knowledge, seeks, and explores changes in teaching behaviors that will improve student performance.
6. The teacher acts as a responsible professional in the overall mission of the school district.

The Revised NSDC Standards for Staff Development (on which the Missouri Rubric for the Commissioner's Award is based) addresses the following:

Context --	Learning Communities Leadership Resources	Content --	Equity Quality Teaching Family Involvement
Process --	Data-Driven Evaluation Research-based Design Learning Collaboration	Resource: Lee's Summit Public Schools	